Published in final edited form as:

Biopolymers. 2014 June ; 101(6): 573–582. doi:10.1002/bip.22419.

Molecular Determinants of the Binding Specificity of BH3 Ligands to BclXL Apoptotic Repressor

Vikas Bhat, Max B. Olenick, Brett J. Schuchardt, David C. Mikles, Caleb B. McDonald, and Amjad Farooq*

Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology, Miller School of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, FL 33136, USA

Abstract

BclXL serves as an apoptotic repressor by virtue of its ability to recognize and bind to BH3 domains found within a diverse array of pro-apoptotic regulators. Herein, we investigate the molecular basis of the specificity of the binding of pro-apoptotic BH3 ligands to BclXL. Our data reveal that while the BH3 ligands harboring the LXXX[A/S]D and [R/Q]XLXXXGD motif bind to BclXL with high affinity in the submicromolar range, those with the LXXXGD motif afford weak interactions. This suggests that the presence of a glycine at the fourth position (G+4)—relative to the N-terminal leucine (L0) within the LXXXGD motif—mitigates binding, unless the LXXXGD motif also contains arginine/glutamine at the –2 position. Of particular note is the observation that the residues at the +4 and –2 positions within the LXXX[A/S]D and [R/Q]XLXXXGD motifs appear to be energetically coupled—replacement of either [A/S]+4 or [R/Q]–2 with other residues has little bearing on the binding affinity of BH3 ligands harboring one of these motifs. Collectively, our study lends new molecular insights into understanding the binding specificity of BH3 ligands to BclXL with important consequences on the design of novel anti-cancer drugs.

Keywords

BclXL-BH3 recognition; Binding specificity; Salt dependence; Energetic coupling

INTRODUCTION

The BclXL apoptotic repressor belongs to the Bcl2 family of proteins that play a central role in determining the apoptotic fate of cells during physiological processes such as embryonic development and cellular homeostasis^{1–8}. Briefly, the Bcl2 proteins can be divided into three major groups with respect to their role in the regulation of apoptotic machinery: activators, effectors and repressors (Figure 1a). In a nutshell, the apoptotic fate—or the decision of a cell to live or die—is determined by the cellular ratio of activator, effector and repressor molecules^{9,10}. In quiescent and healthy cells, the effectors such as Bax and Bak are maintained in an inactive state via complexation with repressors such as BclXL and Bcl2. Upon receiving apoptotic cues, in the form of DNA damage and cellular stress, the activators such as Bid and Bad are stimulated and compete with effectors for binding to the repressors and, in so doing, not only do they neutralize the anti-apoptotic action of repressors but also unleash the pro-apoptogenicity of effectors. The effectors subsequently initiate apoptotic cell death by virtue of their ability to insert into the mitochondrial outer membrane (MOM) resulting in the formation of mitochondrial pores in a manner akin to the

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: amjad@farooqlab.net | tel 305-243-2429 | fax 305-243-3955.

insertion of bacterial toxins such as colicins and diphtheria^{11–15}. This leads to the release of apoptogenic factors such as cytochrome c and Smac/Diablo from mitochondria into the cytosol. Subsequently, rising levels of apoptogenic factors in the cytosol switch on aspartate-specific proteases termed caspases, which in turn, demolish the cellular architecture by cleavage of proteins culminating in total cellular destruction. In this manner, the concerted action of various Bcl2 proteins keeps apoptosis in check in a healthy cell, while their dysregulation is met with serious pathological consequences. In particular, overexpression of BclXL and Bcl2 apoptotic repressors is associated with the development of various cancers^{16–18}. Tellingly, BclXL and Bcl2 rank among some of the most attractive targets for anti-cancer therapy.

While there is a general consensus that hetero-association between various members of the Bcl2 family represents a defining event in the decision of a cell to live or die, the molecular basis of such protein-protein interactions remains hitherto poorly characterized. In particular, the BH3 domain of activators and effectors—which is typically about 20 amino acids in length and characterized by the presence of the core LXXXXD motif (Figure 1b)—has risen to prominence for its key role in mediating apoptosis on at least two major fronts. Firstly, the repressors unleash their anti-apoptotic action by virtue of their ability to bind to the BH3 domain of effectors. Secondly, the activators initiate apoptosis by virtue of the ability of their BH3 domains to compete with the BH3 domains of effectors for binding to repressors and, in so doing, drive the apoptotic machinery by neutralizing the repressors. While substantial efforts have been made over the past decade or so in understanding the molecular basis of the binding specificity of BH3 domains of activators and effectors to apoptotic repressors^{19–31}, further work is clearly warranted. Toward this goal, we employ here various biophysical tools to investigate the molecular basis of the specificity of the binding of pro-apoptotic BH3 ligands to BclXL apoptotic repressor. Briefly, on the basis of its known atomic structure alone and bound to various BH3 peptides^{19,21–23}, BclXL is characterized by canonical Bcl2 topological fold harboring a central predominantly hydrophobic α -helical hairpin “dagger” ($\alpha 5/\alpha 6$) surrounded by a “cloak” comprised of six amphipathic α -helices ($\alpha 1$ – $\alpha 4$ and $\alpha 7$ – $\alpha 8$) of varying lengths (Figure 1c). Additionally, BclXL contains a C-terminal hydrophobic α -helix termed $\alpha 9$, or more commonly the transmembrane (TM) domain, which plays an important role in the localization of BclXL to MOM upon apoptotic induction^{32–34}. Importantly, the BH3 peptides adopt an amphipathic α -helical conformation within the ligand binding groove—a shallow cleft formed by the juxtaposition of $\alpha 2$ – $\alpha 5$ helices within BclXL—and are stabilized via numerous intermolecular contacts. It is noteworthy that while the consensus L0 and D+5 residues within the LXXXXD motif account for core intermolecular interactions between BH3 peptides and BclXL, residues within and flanking this motif further buttress these intermolecular contacts. In this study, we provide evidence that the various BH3 ligands can be dissected into three distinct classes harboring the LXXX[A/S]D, LXXXGD and [R/Q]XLXXXGD motifs on the basis of their binding characteristics to BclXL. Our detailed biophysical analysis sheds new light on the mechanism of BclXL-ligand recognition.

MATERIALS and METHODS

Sample preparation

Human BclXL (residues 1–200) was cloned into pET30 bacterial expression vector with an N-terminal His-tag using Novagen LIC technology, expressed in *Escherichia coli* BL21*(DE3) bacterial strain (Invitrogen) and purified on a Ni-NTA affinity column using standard procedures as described previously^{35,36}. Protein concentration was determined by the fluorescence-based Quant-It assay (Invitrogen) and spectrophotometrically on the basis of an extinction coefficient of 41,940 M⁻¹cm⁻¹ calculated using the online software ProtParam at ExPasy Server³⁷. Results from both methods were in an excellent agreement.

The 20-mer wildtype and mutant peptides spanning the BH3 domains from various human apoptotic effectors and activators were commercially obtained from GenScript Corporation. The amino acid sequence of wildtype BH3 peptides employed in this study is provided in Figure 1b. The concentration of all BH3 peptides was measured gravimetrically.

Isothermal titration calorimetry

Isothermal titration calorimetry (ITC) experiments were performed on a Microcal VP-ITC instrument. Briefly, BclXL and various BH3 peptides were prepared in 50mM Sodium phosphate buffer containing 0–500mM NaCl, 1mM EDTA and 5mM β -mercaptoethanol at pH 7.0. ITC experiments were initiated by injecting $25 \times 10\mu\text{l}$ aliquots of 1–4mM of each BH3 peptide from the syringe into the calorimetric cell containing 50–100 μM of 1.46ml of BclXL at various temperatures in the 15–35°C range. In each case, the change in thermal power as a function of each injection was automatically recorded using the ORIGIN software and the raw data were further processed to yield binding isotherms of heat release per injection as a function of molar ratio of each BH3 peptide to BclXL. The heats of mixing and dilution were subtracted from the heats of binding per injection by carrying out a control experiment in which the same buffer in the calorimetric cell was titrated against each BH3 peptide in an identical manner. The apparent equilibrium dissociation constant (K_d) and the enthalpic change (ΔH) associated with peptide binding to BclXL were determined from the non-linear least-squares fit of data to a one-site model as described previously^{38,36}. The binding free energy change (ΔG) was calculated from the following expression:

$$\Delta G = RT \ln K_d \quad [1]$$

where R is the universal molar gas constant (1.99 cal/K/mol) and T is the absolute temperature. The entropic contribution ($T\Delta S$) to the free energy of binding was calculated from the relationship:

$$T\Delta S = \Delta H - \Delta G \quad [2]$$

where ΔH and ΔG are as defined above. Heat capacity change (ΔC_p) and enthalpy change at 60°C (ΔH_{60}) associated with peptide binding to BclXL were determined from the slopes and y-extrapolations to a temperature of 60°C of ΔH -T plots, respectively.

SASA Calculations

Changes in solvent-accessible surface area (SASA) upon the binding of various BH3 peptides to BclXL were subsequently calculated from the experimentally-determined values of ΔC_p and ΔH_{60} . To determine changes in polar SASA ($\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{polar}}$) and apolar SASA ($\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{apolar}}$) upon peptide binding to BclXL, it was assumed that ΔC_p and ΔH_{60} are additive and linearly depend on the change in $\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{polar}}$ and $\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{apolar}}$ as embodied in the following empirically-derived expressions^{39–42}:

$$\Delta C_p = a[\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{polar}}] + b[\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{apolar}}] \quad [3]$$

$$\Delta H_{60} = c[\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{polar}}] + d[\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{apolar}}] \quad [4]$$

where a, b, c and d are empirically-determined coefficients with values of $-0.14 \text{ cal/mol/K/}\text{\AA}^2$, $+0.32 \text{ cal/mol/K/}\text{\AA}^2$, $+31.34 \text{ cal/mol/}\text{\AA}^2$ and $-8.44 \text{ cal/mol/}\text{\AA}^2$, respectively. The coefficients a and b are independent of temperature, while c and d refer to a temperature of 60°C, which equates to the median melting temperature of the proteins from which these constants are derived^{39–42}. With ΔC_p and ΔH_{60} experimentally determined using ITC and the knowledge of coefficients a-d from empirical models^{39–42}, Eqs [3] and [4] were

simultaneously solved to obtain the magnitudes of $\Delta\text{SASA}_{\text{polar}}$ and $\Delta\text{SASA}_{\text{apolar}}$. Total change in SASA ($\Delta\text{SASA}_{\text{total}}$) is defined by the following equation:

$$\Delta\text{SASA}_{\text{total}} = \Delta\text{SASA}_{\text{polar}} + \Delta\text{SASA}_{\text{apolar}} \quad [5]$$

Molecular modeling

Structural model of BclXL (residues 1–200) in complex with 20-mer BH3 peptide derived from Puma was built using the MODELLER software based on homology modeling⁴³. Briefly, the structural model was constructed using respectively the NMR and X-ray structures of truncated BclXL in complex with BH3 peptides derived from Bad (PDBID 1G5J) and Bim (PDBID 1PQ1) in a multi-template alignment fashion. A total of 100 structural models were calculated and the structure with the lowest energy, as judged by the MODELLER Objective Function, was selected for further analysis. The structural model was rendered using RIBBONS⁴⁴.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

BH3 ligands recognize BclXL in a differential manner

Over the past decade or so, unraveling the specificity of BH3 ligands toward BclXL and other apoptotic repressors has been an area of immense interest. In particular, previous studies have revealed that residues within and flanking the LXXXXD motif account for the specificity of binding of BH3 ligands to apoptotic repressors^{19–31}. Importantly, these studies show that in addition to consensus leucine (L0) and aspartate (D+5) within the LXXXXD motif of BH3 peptides (Figure 1b), the hydrophobic residues at the –4, +3 and +7 positions represent interaction “hotspots” that determine the selectivity of molecular recognition by virtue of their ability to align along one face of the amphipathic BH3 α -helix that is accommodated within the binding groove of Bcl2 proteins. In an effort to further build on this work and to understand the ligand specificity of BclXL toward apoptotic activators and effectors, we measured the binding of BclXL to BH3 peptides derived from various Bcl2 proteins using ITC (Figure 2 and Table 1).

Our data reveal that while all BH3 ligands are characterized by the presence of the core LXXXXD motif (Figure 1b), residues within and flanking this motif further fortify the BclXL-ligand interaction in a highly rational manner. In particular, the various BH3 ligands of BclXL can be divided into three major classes on the basis of the distinct motifs that they harbor. As noted in Table 1, the three major motifs include LXXX[A/S]D (Class I), LXXXGD (Class II) and [R/Q]LXXXXGD (Class III). Of particular note is the observation that the BH3 ligands characterized by these motifs display distinct affinities upon binding to BclXL. Thus, while BH3 ligands harboring the LXXX[A/S]D and [R/Q]LXXXXGD motifs bind to BclXL with submicromolar affinities, those harboring the LXXXGD motif do so with affinities that are between one-to-two orders of magnitude weaker in the micromolar range. This suggests that the presence of a glycine at the fourth position (G+4)—relative to the N-terminal leucine (L0) within the LXXXGD motif (Figure 1b)—mitigates binding, unless the LXXXGD motif also contains arginine/glutamine at the –2 position.

Energetic coupling accounts for high-affinity binding of BH3 ligands to BclXL

Our data presented above provoke the notion that the residues located respectively at the +4 and –2 positions within the LXXX[A/S]D and [R/Q]LXXXXGD motifs are energetically coupled. Simply put, the replacement of alanine/serine at the +4 position is largely compensated by arginine/glutamine at the –2 position and vice versa. In order to test this hypothesis, we generated various mutant BH3 peptides to probe the effect of appropriate

amino acid changes within and flanking the LXXXXD motif and subsequently analyzed their binding to BclXL using ITC in a manner akin to that conducted for wildtype BH3 peptides. As shown in Table 2, our analysis reveals that the A+4G substitution within the Puma peptide (Puma_A+4G) harboring the high-affinity LXXX[A/S]D motif results in the loss of binding affinity to BclXL by nearly an order of magnitude, implying that the A+4G replacement within the BH3 ligands harboring the LXXXGD motif indeed accounts for their low-affinity binding to BclXL. This view is further substantiated by the observation that the G+4A substitution within the Hrk peptide (Hrk_G+4A) harboring the LXXXGD motif augments its affinity by more than five-folds from micromolar to submicromolar regime. It is noteworthy that such stabilizing effect of glycine-alanine substitution at the +4 position within the Bim peptide has been previously reported ²⁵.

Next, to test the notion that the location of an arginine (R-2) or a glutamine (Q-2) at the -2 position restores the loss of binding energy due to the A+4G replacement within the LXXXXD motif, we measured the binding of Bid and Bim peptides respectively harboring the R-2A (Bid_R-2A) and Q-2A (Bim_Q-2A) substitutions to BclXL (Table 2).

Unsurprisingly, these substitutions mitigate the binding of both of these BH3 peptides harboring the high-affinity [R/Q]LXXXXGD motif to BclXL by several folds. Moreover, the L-2R and A-2Q substitutions within Bik (Bik_L-2R) and Hrk (Hrk_A-2Q) peptides harboring the low-affinity LXXXGD motif result in the enhancement of binding affinity to BclXL by close to an order of magnitude. This finding implies that the location of arginine/ glutamine at the -2 position promotes the binding of BH3 ligands harboring the [R/Q]LXXXXGD motif with high affinity. Notably, of all the BH3 ligands analyzed here, Bad is the only one that contains a serine residue at the +4 position (S+4) within the LXXXXD motif in lieu of an alanine or a glycine. To test whether a serine can substitute for an alanine (A+4) or whether it mimics glycine (G+4) at the +4 position, we introduced the R-2A substitution into Bad peptide (Bad_R-2A) harboring the RXLXXXSD motif and measured its binding to BclXL (Table 2). Our data show that the R-2A substitution has negligible effect on the binding affinity of Bad peptide, implying that the S+4 residue behaves in a manner akin to A+4 in lieu of G+4. To further test this notion, we also introduced R-2A/S+4A (Bad_AA) and R-2A/S+4G (Bad_AG) double substitutions into Bad peptide and analyzed their binding to BclXL. Consistent with our hypothesis, while the binding of Bad_AA peptide (AXLXXX[A/S]D) to BclXL is accompanied by an affinity similar to that observed for the binding of wildtype Bad peptide, the Bad_AG peptide (AXLXXXGD) displays low-affinity binding to BclXL by about five-folds. This further corroborates the view that the energetic contribution of S+4 residue is similar to that of A+4 instead of G+4 within the LXXXXD motif.

Finally, to directly test the notion that the residues located respectively at the +4 and -2 positions within the LXXX[A/S]D and [R/Q]LXXXXGD motifs are energetically coupled, we introduced the R-2A (Bmf_R-2A) and A+4G (Bmf_A+G) single substitutions along with the R-2A/A+4G double-substitution (Bmf_AG) into Bmf peptide and analyzed their binding to BclXL (Table 2). Consistent with our data presented above, while the binding of Bmf_R-2A and Bmf_A+4G single-mutant peptides to BclXL results in the cumulative loss of binding energy of less than 1 kcal/mol relative to the wildtype Bmf peptide, the binding of Bmf_AG double-mutant peptide encounters the loss of more than 2 kcal/mol of binding energy. This unequivocally demonstrates that the loss of at least an extra 1 kcal/mol of free energy accompanying the binding of double-mutant Bmf peptide relative to composite effect of single-mutant Bmf peptides represents the contribution of coupling energy arising from energetic coupling of residues located respectively at the +4 and -2 positions within the LXXX[A/S]D and [R/Q]LXXXXGD motifs.

Differential binding of BH3 ligands to BclXL poorly correlates with the extent of surface burial

In order to understand the contribution of polar and apolar residues in driving the BclXL-ligand interactions, we next measured the dependence of enthalpic change (ΔH) associated with the binding of various BH3 peptides to BclXL on temperature (Figure 3). Importantly, the temperature-dependence of ΔH is related to the change in heat capacity (ΔC_p) by Kirchhoff's relationship $\Delta C_p = d(\Delta H)/dT$, where T denotes temperature. Accordingly, ΔC_p accompanying the binding of various BH3 peptides to BclXL was determined from the corresponding slopes of ΔH - T plots (Figure 3 and Table 3). It is noteworthy that a negative value of ΔC_p was observed across-the-board, implying that the binding of all BH3 peptides to BclXL is concomitant with the burial of predominantly apolar residues over polar groups. However, there appears to be a little correlation between ΔC_p and the free energy (ΔG) of binding. Thus, for example, while ΔC_p accompanying the binding of high-affinity ligand such as Puma is -304 cal/mol/K, low-affinity ligand such as Hrk experiences only a slightly smaller ΔC_p of -276 cal/mol/K. On the other hand, while both high-affinity ligands such as Bid and Bad bind to BclXL with similar affinities, the ΔC_p associated with the binding of Bad (-389 cal/mol/K) is more than two-fold greater than that of Bid (-172 cal/mol/K).

In order to quantify how such differential changes in ΔC_p may reflect the extent of burial of polar and apolar surfaces upon the binding of various BH3 ligands to BclXL, we also calculated the corresponding changes in solvent-accessible surface area (SASA) using empirically-derived Eqs [3] and [4]^{39–42}. As noted in Table 3, the change in apolar SASA ($\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{apolar}}$) is on average about 50% greater than the corresponding change in polar SASA ($\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{polar}}$) for the binding of each BH3 peptide to BclXL. This implies that the hydrophobic forces play a dominant role in driving BclXL-ligand interactions.

Hydrophobic and electrostatic interactions contribute differentially to the binding of various BH3 ligands to BclXL

The fact that the differential binding of BH3 ligands to BclXL poorly correlates with the extent of surface area burial, as measured by changes in heat capacity change, strongly suggests that hydrophobic residues and salt bridges play an intricate role in mediating the BclXL-ligand interactions. In an attempt to further elucidate such interplay between these forces, we next measured the effect of increasing NaCl concentration on the binding of BH3 peptides to BclXL (Figure 4). Our data reveal that salt modulates the binding of high-affinity Class I (LXXX[A/S]D) and Class III ([R/Q]XLXXXGD) ligands to BclXL in a distinct manner from that observed for low-affinity Class II (LXXXGD) ligands. Thus, while increasing salt concentration from 0–500mM is concomitant with a reduction in the binding of Class I and III ligands to BclXL from submicromolar to low micromolar range (Figures 4a and 4c), Class II ligands experience an increase in binding affinity by up to several folds over the same salt concentration range (Figure 4b). This strongly suggests that while hydrophobic residues likely dominate ionic interactions in driving the binding of Class II ligands to BclXL, the converse applies in the case of Class I and III ligands. While it is clearly beyond the scope of this study, these data warrant further investigation into the differential role of specific charged and hydrophobic residues in driving BclXL-ligand interactions.

CONCLUSIONS

While it is well understood that the various BH3 ligands recognize apoptotic repressors such as BclXL with distinct affinities^{19–31}, our data presented above lend new insights into the molecular determinants of their specificity and recognition. In particular, our analysis suggests that the various pro-apoptotic BH3 ligands of BclXL can be all dissected into three

distinct classes harboring the LXXX[A/S]D (Class I), LXXXGD (Class II) and [R/Q]XLXXXGD (Class III) motifs on the basis of their sequence and binding characteristics. Thus, while Class I and III ligands appear to recognize BclXL with high affinity in the submicromolar range, Class II ligands afford weak interactions. While our study suggests that the differential binding of various BH3 ligands to BclXL can be rationalized in terms of three distinct motifs that they harbor, it should however be borne in mind that additional residues within and flanking the core LXXXXD motif are also likely to participate in key intermolecular contacts, thereby adding another layer of complexity to understanding the differences in the binding of BH3 ligands to BclXL.

In particular, the role of non-consensus residues within and flanking the LXXX[A/S]D, LXXXGD and [R/Q]XLXXXGD motifs is likely to be context-dependent and this could further blur the rather simple picture presented here. It is also noteworthy that while the distinction between LXXX[A/S]D (Class I) and [R/Q]XLXXXGD (Class III) motifs is poor, it was nonetheless necessary to emphasize the fact that the molecular origin underlying high-affinity binding of these two motifs is quite distinct. Thus, while the LXXX[A/S]D motif would achieve high-affinity binding by virtue of the presence of an alanine/serine at the +4 position, the [R/Q]XLXXXGD motif would do so via the presence of an arginine/glutamine at the -2 position owing to the fact that these residues are energetically coupled. On the other hand, the choice to place both the glutamine and arginine at the -2 position in the same category was largely based on the fact that the Bim peptide harboring a glutamine at the -2 position binds to BclXL with an affinity that is virtually indistinguishable from those observed for the binding of Bid and Bak peptides, both of which contain an arginine at the -2 position. Nonetheless, we acknowledge that such merger is somewhat arbitrary and further work is warranted to shed new light into the role of specific residues not only at the -2 position but also at other positions within the LXXXXD motif.

In short, our study advances our understanding of the binding specificity of BH3 ligands to BclXL and other apoptotic repressors. Given that numerous efforts have been directed toward the development of structural mimetics of BH3 peptides that could target BclXL and other apoptotic repressors with high selectivity over the past decade or so^{45–52}, the importance of our current work on the design of such novel anti-cancer inhibitors cannot be overemphasized.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health Grants R01-GM083897 and funds from the USylvester Braman Family Breast Cancer Institute (to AF). CBM is a recipient of a postdoctoral fellowship from the National Institutes of Health (Award# T32-CA119929).

ABBREVIATIONS

Bad	Bcl2-associated death promoter
Bak	Bcl2-homologous antagonist/killer
Bax	Bcl2-associated protein X
Bcl2	B-cell lymphoma protein 2
BclW	Bcl2-like protein 2
BclXL	B-cell lymphoma extra-large protein
Bfl1	Bcl2-related protein A1
Bid	BH3-interacting domain death agonist

Bik	Bcl2-interacting killer
Bim	Bcl2-interacting mediator
Bmf	Bcl2-modifying factor
Hrk	Harakiri apoptotic activator
ITC	Isothermal titration calorimetry
LIC	Ligation-independent cloning
Mcl1	Myeloid leukemia cell protein 1
MOM	mitochondrial outer membrane
Noxa	Phorbol-induced protein 1
Puma	p53-upregulated modulator of apoptosis
SASA	solvent-accessible surface area
SEC	Size-exclusion chromatography
TM	Transmembrane

REFERENCES

1. Adams JM, Cory S. Science. 1998; 281:1322–1326. [PubMed: 9735050]
2. Gross A, McDonnell JM, Korsmeyer SJ. Genes Dev. 1999; 13:1899–1911. [PubMed: 10444588]
3. Korsmeyer SJ. Cancer Res. 1999; 59:1693s–1700s. [PubMed: 10197582]
4. Kuwana T, Newmeyer DD. Curr Opin Cell Biol. 2003; 15:691–699. [PubMed: 14644193]
5. Dewson G, Kluck RM. J Cell Sci. 2009; 122:2801–2808. [PubMed: 19795525]
6. Chipuk JE, Moldoveanu T, Llambi F, Parsons MJ, Green DR. Mol Cell. 2010; 37:299–310. [PubMed: 20159550]
7. Dejean LM, Ryu SY, Martinez-Caballero S, Teijido O, Peixoto PM, Kinnally KW. Biochim Biophys Acta. 2010; 1797:1231–1238. [PubMed: 20083086]
8. Martinou JC, Youle RJ. Dev Cell. 2011; 21:92–101. [PubMed: 21763611]
9. Chipuk JE, Fisher JC, Dillon CP, Kriwacki RW, Kuwana T, Green DR. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2008; 105:20327–20332. [PubMed: 19074266]
10. Chipuk JE, Green DR. Trends Cell Biol. 2008; 18:157–164. [PubMed: 18314333]
11. van der Goot FG, Gonzalez-Manas JM, Lakey JH, Pattus F. Nature. 1991; 354:408–410. [PubMed: 1956406]
12. London E. Biochim Biophys Acta. 1992; 1113:25–51. [PubMed: 1550860]
13. Lakey JH, van der Goot FG, Pattus F. Toxicology. 1994; 87:85–108. [PubMed: 8160190]
14. Schendel SL, Montal M, Reed JC. Cell Death Differ. 1998; 5:372–380. [PubMed: 10200486]
15. Zakharov SD, Cramer WA. Biochim Biophys Acta. 2002; 1565:333–346. [PubMed: 12409205]
16. Del Bufalo D, Biroccio A, Leonetti C, Zupi G. FASEB J. 1997; 11:947–953. [PubMed: 9337147]
17. Espana L, Fernandez Y, Rubio N, Torregrosa A, Blanco J, Sierra A. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2004; 87:33–44. [PubMed: 15377849]
18. Placzek WJ, Wei J, Kitada S, Zhai D, Reed JC, Pellecchia M. Cell Death Dis. 2010; 1:e40. [PubMed: 21364647]
19. Sattler M, Liang H, Nettesheim D, Meadows RP, Harlan JE, Eberstadt M, Yoon HS, Shuker SB, Chang BS, Minn AJ, Thompson CB, Fesik SW. Science. 1997; 275:983–986. [PubMed: 9020082]
20. Huang DC, Strasser A. Cell. 2000; 103:839–842. [PubMed: 11136969]
21. Petros AM, Nettesheim DG, Wang Y, Olejniczak ET, Meadows RP, Mack J, Swift K, Matayoshi ED, Zhang H, Thompson CB, Fesik SW. Protein Sci. 2000; 9:2528–2534. [PubMed: 11206074]

22. Liu X, Dai S, Zhu Y, Marrack P, Kappler JW. *Immunity*. 2003; 19:341–352. [PubMed: 14499110]
23. Petros AM, Olejniczak ET, Fesik SW. *Biochim Biophys Acta*. 2004; 1644:83–94. [PubMed: 14996493]
24. Lee EF, Czabotar PE, Smith BJ, Deshayes K, Zobel K, Colman PM, Fairlie WD. *Cell Death Differ*. 2007; 14:1711–1713. [PubMed: 17572662]
25. Boersma MD, Sadowsky JD, Tomita YA, Gellman SH. *Protein Sci*. 2008; 17:1232–1240. [PubMed: 18467496]
26. Noble CG, Dong JM, Manser E, Song H. *J Biol Chem*. 2008; 283:26274–26282. [PubMed: 18641390]
27. Moroy G, Martin E, Dejaegere A, Stote RH. *J Biol Chem*. 2009; 284:17499–17511. [PubMed: 19293158]
28. Yao Y, Bobkov AA, Plesniak LA, Marassi FM. *Biochemistry*. 2009; 48:8704–8711. [PubMed: 19670908]
29. Dutta S, Gulla S, Chen TS, Fire E, Grant RA, Keating AE. *J Mol Biol*. 2010; 398:747–762. [PubMed: 20363230]
30. Ku B, Liang C, Jung JU, Oh BH. *Cell Res*. 2011; 21:627–641. [PubMed: 21060336]
31. London N, Gulla S, Keating AE, Schueler-Furman O. *Biochemistry*. 2012; 51:5841–5850. [PubMed: 22702834]
32. Krajewski S, Tanaka S, Takayama S, Schibler MJ, Fenton W, Reed JC. *Cancer Res*. 1993; 53:4701–4714. [PubMed: 8402648]
33. Gonzalez-Garcia M, Perez-Ballester R, Ding L, Duan L, Boise LH, Thompson CB, Nunez G. *Development*. 1994; 120:3033–3042. [PubMed: 7607090]
34. Zha H, Fisk HA, Yaffe MP, Mahajan N, Herman B, Reed JC. *Mol Cell Biol*. 1996; 16:6494–6508. [PubMed: 8887678]
35. Bhat V, Kurouski D, Olenick MB, McDonald CB, Mikles DC, Deegan BJ, Seldeen KL, Lednev IK, Farooq A. *Arch Biochem Biophys*. 2012; 528:32–44. [PubMed: 22960132]
36. Bhat V, McDonald CB, Mikles DC, Deegan BJ, Seldeen KL, Bates ML, Farooq A. *J Mol Biol*. 2012; 416:57–77. [PubMed: 22197371]
37. Gasteiger, E.; Hoogland, C.; Gattiker, A.; Duvaud, S.; Wilkins, MR.; Appel, RD.; Bairoch, A. Protein Identification and Analysis Tools on the ExPASy Server. In: Walker, JM., editor. *The Proteomics Protocols Handbook*. Totowa, New Jersey, USA: Humana Press; 2005. p. 571-607.
38. Wiseman T, Williston S, Brandts JF, Lin LN. *Anal. Biochem*. 1989; 179:131–137. [PubMed: 2757186]
39. Murphy KP, Freire E. *Adv Protein Chem*. 1992; 43:313–361. [PubMed: 1442323]
40. Spolar RS, Record MT. *J Science*. 1994; 263:777–784.
41. Xie D, Freire E. *Proteins*. 1994; 19:291–301. [PubMed: 7984625]
42. Edgcomb SP, Murphy KP. *Curr Opin Biotechnol*. 2000; 11:62–66. [PubMed: 10679345]
43. Marti-Renom MA, Stuart AC, Fiser A, Sanchez R, Melo F, Sali A. *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct*. 2000; 29:291–325. [PubMed: 10940251]
44. Carson MJ. *Appl. Crystallogr*. 1991; 24:958–961.
45. Walensky LD, Kung AL, Escher I, Malia TJ, Barbuto S, Wright RD, Wagner G, Verdine GL, Korsmeyer SJ. *Science*. 2004; 305:1466–1470. [PubMed: 15353804]
46. Sadowsky JD, Schmitt MA, Lee HS, Umezawa N, Wang S, Tomita Y, Gellman SH. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2005; 127:11966–11968. [PubMed: 16117535]
47. Walensky LD, Pitter K, Morash J, Oh KJ, Barbuto S, Fisher J, Smith E, Verdine GL, Korsmeyer SJ. *Mol Cell*. 2006; 24:199–210. [PubMed: 17052454]
48. Sadowsky JD, Fairlie WD, Hadley EB, Lee HS, Umezawa N, Nikolovska-Coleska Z, Wang S, Huang DC, Tomita Y, Gellman SH. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2007; 129:139–154. [PubMed: 17199293]
49. Sadowsky JD, Murray JK, Tomita Y, Gellman SH. *Chembiochem*. 2007; 8:903–916. [PubMed: 17503422]
50. Horne WS, Boersma MD, Windsor MA, Gellman SH. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl*. 2008; 47:2853–2856. [PubMed: 18330876]

51. Lee EF, Smith BJ, Horne WS, Mayer KN, Evangelista M, Colman PM, Gellman SH, Fairlie WD. *Chembiochem*. 2011; 12:2025–2032. [PubMed: 21744457]
52. Boersma MD, Haase HS, Peterson-Kaufman KJ, Lee EF, Clarke OB, Colman PM, Smith BJ, Horne WS, Fairlie WD, Gellman SH. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2012; 134:315–323. [PubMed: 22040025]

Figure 1.

An overview of Bcl2 proteins. (a) Modular organization of repressors, effectors and activators. The activators belong to the BH3-only proteins, where BH3 is the Bcl2 homology 3 domain. Examples of activators include Bad, Bid, Bik, Bim, Bmf, Hrk, Noxa and Puma. The effectors contain the BH3-BH1-BH2-TM modular architecture, where TM is the transmembrane domain located C-terminal to Bcl2 homology domains BH3, BH1 and BH2. Examples of effectors are Bak and Bax. The repressors are usually characterized by the BH4-BH3-BH1-BH2-TM modular organization, with an additional N-terminal Bcl2 homology 4 domain. Examples of repressors are BclXL, Bcl2, BclW, Mcl1 and Bfl1. (b) Amino acid sequence alignment of BH3 domains of various effectors and activators encoded by the human genome and employed in this study as ligands for BclXL. Note that the absolutely conserved consensus leucine and aspartate residues within the core LXXXXD motif shared by all BH3 domains are colored red. The numerals indicate the nomenclature used in this study to distinguish residues within and flanking the core LXXXXD motif relative to the consensus leucine, which is arbitrarily assigned zero. (c) Structural model of BclXL bound to BH3 peptide of Puma. In BclXL, the hydrophobic α -helical hairpin dagger ($\alpha 5/\alpha 6$) is colored blue, the amphipathic α -helical cloak ($\alpha 1-\alpha 4$ and $\alpha 7-\alpha 8$) is colored green, and the loops in gray. The C-terminal TM domain ($\alpha 9$ helix) was not modeled into the structure for the sake of simplicity. The α -helical BH3 peptide is colored brown. Note that the consensus leucine (L0) and aspartate (D+5) residues within the LXXXXD motif of BH3 peptide are shown in yellow and their respective intermolecular counterparts (F146 and R139) within BclXL in red.

Figure 2.

Representative ITC isotherms for the binding of BH3 peptides of Puma (a), Bax (b) and Bad (c) to BclXL in Sodium phosphate buffer containing 100mM NaCl at 25°C and pH 7. The upper panels show raw ITC data expressed as change in thermal power with respect to time over the period of titration. In the lower panels, change in molar heat is expressed as a function of molar ratio of each BH3 peptide to BclXL. The solid lines in the lower panels show non-linear least squares fit of data to a one-site binding model using ORIGIN as described previously^{38,36}.

Figure 3. Dependence of enthalpy (ΔH) on temperature (T) for the binding of BH3 peptides of Puma, Bax and Bad to BclXL in Sodium phosphate buffer containing 100mM NaCl at pH 7. The solid lines through the data points represent linear fits. Error bars were calculated from at least three independent measurements to one standard deviation.

Figure 4. Effect of NaCl concentration on the binding, as measured by the binding constant (K_d), of various BH3 peptides harboring LXXX[A/S]D (a), LXXXGD (b) and [R/Q]XLXXXGD (c) motifs to BclXL in Sodium phosphate buffer at 25°C and pH 7. Note that the solid lines are used to connect various data points for clarity. Error bars were calculated from at least three independent measurements to one standard deviation.

Table 1

Thermodynamic parameters for the binding of various wildtype BH3 peptides to BclXL in Sodium phosphate buffer containing 100mM NaCl at 25°C and pH 7

Peptide	Sequence	K _d / μM	ΔH / kcal.mol ⁻¹	TΔS / kcal.mol ⁻¹	ΔG / kcal.mol ⁻¹
Class I: LXXX(A/S)D motif					
Bmf	QAEVQLARKLQC IA DQFHL	0.20 ± 0.05	-6.67 ± 0.22	+2.50 ± 0.07	-9.17 ± 0.15
Puma	QWAREIGAQLRRM AD DLNAQ	0.22 ± 0.05	-6.88 ± 0.16	+2.23 ± 0.03	-9.11 ± 0.14
Bad	WAAQRYGRE LR RM SD EFVDS	0.41 ± 0.15	-7.00 ± 0.14	+1.74 ± 0.09	-8.74 ± 0.23
Class II: LXXXGD motif					
Hrk	SAAQLTAAR L KAL GD ELHQR	4.69 ± 1.21	-3.32 ± 0.06	+3.97 ± 0.21	-7.29 ± 0.15
Bax	ASTKKLSES L KRI GD ELDSN	6.35 ± 1.13	-3.50 ± 0.04	+3.59 ± 0.07	-7.10 ± 0.11
Bik	EGSDALALR L ACI GD EMDVS	17.49 ± 2.98	-2.68 ± 0.09	+3.81 ± 0.19	-6.50 ± 0.11
Noxa	ELEVECATQ LR RF GD KLNFR	26.01 ± 6.05	-3.21 ± 0.12	+3.06 ± 0.25	-6.26 ± 0.14
Class III: [R/Q]LXXXGD motif					
Bid	DIIRNIAR L HAQ GD SMDRS	0.35 ± 0.07	-7.18 ± 0.27	+1.64 ± 0.15	-8.82 ± 0.12
Bim	RPEIWIAR Q ELRR GD EFNAY	0.65 ± 0.17	-2.25 ± 0.07	+6.21 ± 0.08	-8.46 ± 0.15
Bak	STMGGVGR Q LAI GD DINRR	0.47 ± 0.09	-7.58 ± 0.18	+1.07 ± 0.06	-8.65 ± 0.12

Note that the BH3 peptides are divided into three classes on the basis of the consensus motif that they harbor. Consensus residues within each motif are colored red. All parameters were obtained from ITC measurements. Errors were calculated from at least three independent measurements to one standard deviation.

Table 2

Thermodynamic parameters for the binding of various mutant BH3 peptides to BclXL in Sodium phosphate buffer containing 100mM NaCl at 25°C and pH 7

Peptide	Sequence	K _d / μ M	ΔH / kcal.mol ⁻¹	T ΔS / kcal.mol ⁻¹	ΔG / kcal.mol ⁻¹
Puma_A+4G	QWAREIGAQLRRRM GD DLNAQ	1.80 $\pm$ 0.46	-6.49 $\pm$ 0.09	+1.37 $\pm$ 0.05	-7.86 $\pm$ 0.15
Hrk_G+4A	SAAQLTAAR L KAL AD ELHQ	0.81 $\pm$ 0.17	-1.09 $\pm$ 0.04	+7.23 $\pm$ 0.08	-8.33 $\pm$ 0.13
Bid_R-2A	DIIRNIA HL LAQVG DS MDRS	1.59 $\pm$ 0.27	-6.49 $\pm$ 0.11	+1.43 $\pm$ 0.01	-7.92 $\pm$ 0.12
Bim_Q-2A	RPEIWI AAEL RRIG DEF NAY	1.60 $\pm$ 0.35	-0.95 $\pm$ 0.02	+6.97 $\pm$ 0.14	-7.92 $\pm$ 0.13
Bik_L-2R	EGSDAL ARR LACIG DE MDVS	2.11 $\pm$ 0.55	-4.44 $\pm$ 0.15	+3.33 $\pm$ 0.01	-7.76 $\pm$ 0.16
Hrk_A-2Q	SAAQLTA QL KAL GD ELHQ	0.78 $\pm$ 0.16	-2.80 $\pm$ 0.08	+5.54 $\pm$ 0.05	-8.34 $\pm$ 0.12
Bad_R-2A	WAAQRYGA EL RRMS DEF VDS	0.58 $\pm$ 0.13	-3.72 $\pm$ 0.16	+4.80 $\pm$ 0.03	-8.52 $\pm$ 0.13
Bad_AA	WAAQRYGA EL RRM AD EFVDS	0.31 $\pm$ 0.05	-5.06 $\pm$ 0.13	+3.84 $\pm$ 0.03	-8.90 $\pm$ 0.10
Bad_AG	WAAQRYGA EL RRM GDEF VDS	1.80 $\pm$ 0.37	-3.09 $\pm$ 0.08	+4.77 $\pm$ 0.04	-7.85 $\pm$ 0.12
Bmf_R-2A	QAEVQIA AKL QCIA DQ FHRL	0.32 $\pm$ 0.08	-5.73 $\pm$ 0.20	+3.15 $\pm$ 0.04	-8.88 $\pm$ 0.16
Bmf_A+4G	QAEVQIARK LQCI GDQ FHRL	0.43 $\pm$ 0.14	-6.14 $\pm$ 0.13	+2.57 $\pm$ 0.07	-8.71 $\pm$ 0.20
Bmf_AG	QAEVQIA AKL QC IGDQ FHRL	6.53 $\pm$ 1.43	-3.65 $\pm$ 0.17	+3.44 $\pm$ 0.03	-7.09 $\pm$ 0.13

Note that the absolutely conserved leucine and aspartate residues within the core LXXXXD motif shared by all BH3 peptides are colored red, while the mutated residues within and flanking this motif are shown in blue for clarity. The nomenclature used for the relative positions of various residues is as described in Figure 1b. All parameters were obtained from ITC measurements. Errors were calculated from at least three independent measurements to one standard deviation.

Table 3

Δ SASA values determined from thermodynamic parameters for the binding of various wildtype BH3 peptides to BclXL in Sodium phosphate buffer containing 100mM NaCl at pH 7

Peptide	Sequence	$\Delta H_{60} / \text{kcal.mol}^{-1}$	$\Delta C_p / \text{cal.mol}^{-1} \cdot \text{K}^{-1}$	$\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{polar}} / \text{\AA}^2$	$\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{apolar}} / \text{\AA}^2$	$\Delta \text{SASA}_{\text{total}} / \text{\AA}^2$
Class I: LXXI[A/S]D motif						
Puma	QWAREIGAQ L RRM AD DLNAQ	-17.24 ± 0.25	-304 ± 5	-914 ± 12	-1350 ± 14	-2264 ± 26
Bmf	QAEVQIARK L QCI AD QFHL	-18.78 ± 0.38	-356 ± 4	-1019 ± 18	-1558 ± 21	-2578 ± 39
Bad	WAAQRYGRE L RRM SD EFVDS	-20.73 ± 0.64	-389 ± 12	-1122 ± 35	-1708 ± 53	-2829 ± 88
Class II: LXXXGD motif						
Bax	ASTKKLSES L KRI GD ELDSN	-11.81 ± 0.36	-234 ± 7	-650 ± 21	-1014 ± 34	-1664 ± 54
Hrk	SAAQLTAAR L KAL GD ELHQR	-12.93 ± 0.16	-276 ± 3	-731 ± 8	-1183 ± 12	-1914 ± 21
Bik	EGSDALALR L ACI GD EMDVS	-8.43 ± 0.34	-164 ± 6	-461 ± 18	-713 ± 28	-1174 ± 46
Noxa	ELEVECAT L RRF GD KLNFR	-9.19 ± 0.07	-168 ± 4	-493 ± 6	-741 ± 16	-1233 ± 23
Class III: [R/Q]LXXXGD motif						
Bid	DIIRNIA R HLAQ GD SMDRS	-13.35 ± 0.34	-172 ± 4	-647 ± 17	-819 ± 23	-1466 ± 40
Bim	RPEIWIA Q ELRR GD EFNAY	-8.50 ± 0.29	-175 ± 4	-475 ± 15	-755 ± 19	-1229 ± 35
Bak	STMQVGR Q LAI GD DINRR	-16.64 ± 0.33	-261 ± 4	-851 ± 16	-1188 ± 20	-2039 ± 37

Errors were calculated from at least three independent measurements to one standard deviation.